

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 20, 2007.

Claims 1-67 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-67.

The present Response amends claims 1-34, 37, 43, 46-51, 54, 58-60, and 63-66 and cancels claim 67, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-66. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

I. Double Patenting

Claims 18, 30, and 31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-32 of co-pending Application No. 10/786,742, respectively.

Here, an amendment to the co-pending Application No. 10/786,742 was filed on September 18, 2007. (EFS ID: 2211900). In that amendment, claims 30-32 of co-pending Application No. 10/786,742 were cancelled. Hence, claims 18, 30 and 31 in the present application should be in allowable condition if not otherwise unpatentable.

II. Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because there is a “; and” at the end of the claims.

Claim 1, as currently amended, ends with a period.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 14-19, 22, 27, 30-34, 37, 43, 46-48, 50-51, 54, 60, 63-67 are rejected because the phrase “and/or” is indefinite. All claims are amended to satisfy the statutory requirement under 35 USC § 112.

Claims 9-10, 41-42, and 58-59 are amended to state as “further comprising” instead of “wherein.”

In addition, since both claims 22 and 27 are separate and both dependent directly from claim 18, the “third user interface” in claims 22 and 27 are different and each “third user interface” refers to a separate user interface that is additional to the two user interfaces in the independent claim 18. Furthermore, claim 28 depends on claim 27. Therefore, the “third user interface” refers to the “third user interface” in claim 27.

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC § 101.

Here, claims 1 and 18 are both amended to state as a “*computer-enabled interactive tool*,” hence satisfying the statutory requirement under 35 USC § 101. Therefore, claims 2-17 and 19-32 all satisfy the statutory requirement under 35 USC § 101 as they are dependent claims based on either claim 1 or 18.

In addition, claim 67 is canceled accordingly.

V. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-2, 6-11, 13-19, 23-27, 29-34, 38-43, 45-51, 55-60, 62-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chowdhry et al .

Here, independent claim 1 is amended to include the statement of “*wherein the portal operates to include a desktop and associated desktop resources that includes ... and wherein portal resources operates to be associated with the desktop manually.*” Applicant respectfully submits that Chowdhry fails to teach the portal that operates to include a desktop and associated desktop resources, especially wherein portal resources operates to be associated with the desktop manually. On the other hand, Poulsen only teaches a portal web site development system that allows a user to define or manage the portal web site where a user can define a desktop based on a template. Compared with the present application, where user can manually associate random

portal resources with a desktop, Poulsen merely provides limited ability for the user to define a desktop based on a predefined template in a very restrictive way. Hence claim 1, as currently amended, cannot be anticipated by Chowdhry or rendered obvious by combining Chowdhry and Poulsen. Therefore, claim 1 should be in allowable condition as currently amended. Consequently, dependent claims 2, 6-11, and 13-17, which are all based on independent claim 1, should all be in allowable condition.

Similarly, independent claims 33 and 50 are both amended to include the same statement as in claim 1. Therefore, at least for the same reason, claims 33 and 50, as currently amended, cannot be anticipated by Chowdhry or rendered obvious by combining Chowdhry and Poulsen. Therefore, claims 33 and 50 should be in allowable condition as currently amended. Consequently, dependent claims 34, 38-43, and 45-50, which are based on independent claim 33; and dependent claims 51, 55-60, and 62-66, which are all based on independent claim 50, should all be in allowable condition.

In addition, independent claim 18 is amended to include the statement of “*wherein an entitlement determines what capabilities are available to a portal visitor for the at least one resources based on visitor roles of the portal visitor; and wherein the portal can include the desktop and associated desktop resources that includes....*” Applicant respectfully submits that Chowdhry fails to teach an entitlement that determines what capabilities are available to a portal visitor for the at least one resources based on visitor roles of the portal visitor. In Chowdhry, the administrator can make the information available to any particular registered user or only particular echelons or brackets thereof. However, such an information sharing approach is fundamentally different from the role-based approach taken in the present application. As one example, one user in the present invention can be assigned a different type of entitlement based on the different role the user is undertaking, internal or external. Chowdhry does not teach this role-based approach. Therefore, claim 18, as currently amended, cannot be anticipated by Chowdhry or rendered obvious by combining Chowdhry and Poulsen. Therefore, claim 18

should be in allowable condition as currently amended. Consequently, dependent claims 19, 23-27, and 29-32, which are all based on independent claim 18, should all be in allowable condition.

VI. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 3-5, 20-22, 35-37, and 52-54 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry in view of Poulsen.

Claims 12, 28, 44, and 61 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry

Here, dependent claims 3-5 and 12, which are based on allowable independent claim 1; dependent claims 20-22 and 28, which are based on allowable independent claim 18; dependent claims 35-37 and 44, which are based on allowable independent claim 33; and dependent claims 52-54 and 61, which are based on allowable independent claim 50, should all be in allowable condition.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09/20/2007

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800